

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

OREGON FIREARMS FEDERATION,)	
INC., et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	Case Nos.
v.)	2:22-cv-01815-IM
)	3:22-cv-01859-IM
KATE BROWN, et al.,)	3:22-cv-01862-IM
)	3:22-CV-01869-IM
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	
(Continued))	

* VIDEOCONFERENCE *
VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION UPON ORAL EXAMINATION
OF
KEVIN L. CAMPBELL

Witness located in:

Lake Oswego, Oregon

* All participants appeared via videoconference *

DATE TAKEN: January 17, 2023

REPORTED BY: Tia B. Reidt, Washington RPR, CSR #2798
Oregon #22-0001

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC
206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

88511eb5-ab09-4f7a-94df-2dd3164b0c83

Ex. 7 - Dodd Decl.

Page 1 of 10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Continued))
)
MARK FITZ, et al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
)
ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)
)

KATERINA B. EYRE, et al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
)
ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)
)

DANIEL AZZOPARDI, et al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
)
ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

APPEARANCES

For the Eyre Plaintiffs:

SHAWN M. LINDSAY
JURISLAW, LLP
Three Centerpointe Drive, Suite 160
Lake Oswego, OR 97035
(503) 968-1475
Shawn@jurislawyer.com

For the Defendants:

HARRY WILSON
MARKOWITZ HERBOLD
1455 SW Broadway, Suite 1900
Portland, OR 97201
(503) 972-5076
Harrywilson@markowitzherbold.com

For the Proposed Intervenor-Defendant Oregon Alliance
for Gun Safety:

ZACHARY J. PEKELIS
PACIFICA LAW GROUP
1191 Second Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 245-1700
Zach.Pekelis@PacificaLawGroup.com

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

For Counsel to Oregon Association Chiefs of Police:

AKIN BLITZ
BULLARD LAW
200 SW Broadway, Suite 1950
Portland, OR 97225
(503) 784-1766
Ablitz@bullardlaw.com

Videographer:

ED BURKE
BUELL REALTIME REPORTING
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 287-9066
Info@buellrealtime.com

* * * * *

BUELL REALTIME REPORTING, LLC
206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. Okay.

3 MR. WILSON: I would like to mark two
4 exhibits, that's the declaration and your second
5 declaration. I have emailed copies of those to the
6 court reporter.

7 Mr. Campbell, do you have copies of those in
8 front of you?

9 THE WITNESS: I do.

10 MR. WILSON: Okay.

11 THE COURT REPORTER: One moment. I'll get
12 those marked.

13 (Exhibit 6 marked for identification.)

14 (Exhibit 7 marked for identification.)

15 THE COURT REPORTER: Exhibit 6 and Exhibit
16 7 have been marked.

17 BY MR. WILSON:

18 Q. I believe -- just so we're clear on the
19 record, I'm going to consider Exhibit 6 to be your
20 first declaration, Mr. Campbell, and Exhibit 7 to be
21 your second declaration.

22 A. Great. Thank you.

23 Q. So Mr. Campbell, can you tell me in a general
24 way why you submitted these declarations?

25 A. Yes, I will. So let me -- let me say to be

1 begin with, and I think we've made this clear all
2 along, that we believe it's the court's exclusive
3 jurisdiction to determine issues of constitutionality.

4 When a law is passed, we implement the law.
5 That's our responsibility. We enforce the law to the
6 greatest ability.

7 So the purpose of submitting these was,
8 really, to be helpful to the court as the court is
9 trying to understand the impacts of specifically the
10 permit to purchase part of Ballot Measure 114 and the
11 challenges to implement that local police -- municipal
12 police department's face as we try to navigate that new
13 responsibility. That was our exclusive reason for
14 submitting information to the court.

15 Q. Got it.

16 Just a moment ago, we discussed that you had
17 submitted your declarations in connection with the case
18 filed by, among other plaintiffs, Katerina Eyre;
19 correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. And were you asked by one of the plaintiffs in
22 that case to provide the declaration?

23 A. I was not. I was asked by Elmer Dickens.
24 Elmer is the legal counsel for the Oregon State
25 Sheriffs' Association. I think he was trying to find a

1 Personnel has to be put in place which don't currently
2 exist in the municipal side. So we're really looking
3 at how quickly -- even if it's legally possible to do,
4 how quickly can we practically operationalize a permit
5 to purchase process.

6 Q. So based on the two categories I just
7 identified, other than the fingerprint issue, are you
8 aware of any other obstacle to the implementation of
9 Measure 114 that would legally prohibit the issuance of
10 permits?

11 A. I am not -- I am not aware or cannot remember
12 if there are any others that would represent a legal
13 obstacle to implementing this.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. Other than whatever the courts decide on this.
16 Obviously, the courts have an impact.

17 Q. Yeah.

18 And I guess we should just put that on the
19 record too.

20 You understand that the Federal Court has
21 stayed enforcement of the permit requirement until
22 March 8th; correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And that the State Court has stayed all of
25 Measure 114, at least on a preliminary basis; correct?

1 for one in many of these agencies. I would say yes.

2 Q. So if Measure 114 were to go into effect, for
3 example, if the injunctions were lifted by the various
4 courts and the fingerprint issue was otherwise
5 resolved, agencies would make determinations about
6 implementation of Measure 114 by weighing that
7 implementation versus the other demands on their
8 resources.

9 Is that fair?

10 A. I don't know if that's fair for me to say. I
11 mean, every jurisdiction is going to make their own
12 determinations based on their priorities. And I don't
13 know -- it's been my impression that agencies have, in
14 a resource-constrained environment, struggled just to
15 provide basic public safety services.

16 And so this is a new -- it's a new expectation
17 that's going to be in place. I think the public who
18 are wanting to purchase a firearm are going to expect
19 that police agencies are able to process their permit.
20 So there's a public expectation, I think, out there.
21 And that will make -- that will put agencies in a very
22 difficult situation because of their resource
23 constraints.

24 Q. Are you aware of any municipal police agency
25 that has stated that it would flat out refuse to

1 implement Measure 114?

2 A. No. But I'm not -- I would not be surprised
3 if there are some out there. I would -- and it may
4 just be because of -- they don't believe they can
5 actually manage it in terms of the administrative
6 burden. There may be other reasons, but I have not
7 heard that.

8 Q. Okay.

9 So you're not aware of --

10 A. That doesn't mean there aren't folks out there
11 for sure.

12 Q. Okay.

13 You're not aware of any particular agency?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Do you expect that there would be any date or
16 any time in the future when you would be able to
17 provide an estimate about how much time remains
18 necessary to implement Measure 114?

19 A. I'd like to be able to give you a time, but
20 I'm just really not sure at this point.

21 Q. And I'm sorry to keep asking this question
22 over and over --

23 A. That's all right.

24 Q. -- but I just want to get as best a sense as I
25 can.

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF WASHINGTON

COUNTY OF PIERCE

I, Tia Reidt, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the deposition of Kevin L. Campbell, having been duly sworn, on January 17, 2023, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 24th day of January, 2023.



/s/ Tia B. Reidt
Tia B. Reidt, RPR, CSR #22-0001
NOTARY PUBLIC, State of
Washington.
My commission expires
5/15/2026.